

Response and Amendment  
Application No. 10/073,929  
Filing Date: Feb. 14th, 2002  
Page 11 of 13

### REMARKS

Claims 1 through 30 are pending in this application and in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants are grateful for the courtesies extended during the interview with Examiner Liu and SPE Saras to discuss the rejection of claims 1-30. The substance of the agreement reached during that interview is made of record in the interview summary dated February 3<sup>rd</sup> 2004.

Claims 1-21 and 24-30 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,798,752 to Buxton et al, and claims 14 and 15 were rejected as being obvious in view of Buxton.

Claim 8 was objected to on formal grounds. These rejections and objection are believed to be obviated in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### ***Rejection of Claims 1-21 and 24-30 Under 35 USC 102(b)***

Claims 1-21 and 24-30 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,798,752 to Buxton et al.

As noted during the interview, the Applicant offers digitizers and wireless mouse pointing devices for use with bundled application program software. In accordance with the present invention, an application program includes a compatible instruction set with an application program emulator enabling use of bundled input devices (e.g., a digitizer stylus and mouse) by the efficient two-handed method as disclosed in the application.

Independent claims 1, 16, 23, 24 and 30 have been amended to more clearly point out this novel feature, and so this rejection is respectfully traversed and is believed to be obviated in view of the foregoing amendments.

Applicants pointed out the inapplicability of Buxton, et al, which does include a discussion on use of a "translator" for modifying pointer signals into a "universal language" (see, e.g., Buxton's description at column 10, beginning at line 60), but Buxton's translator does not incorporate an instruction set which is demonstrated, in advance, to be compatible with a specific application program, as recited in the claims. The instruction set of the present invention, combined with the two input differing input device structure, are not shown or suggested by Buxton et al.

Response and Amendment  
Application No. 10/073,929  
Filing Date: Feb. 14th, 2002  
Page 12 of 13

Dependant claims 2-15, 17-22, and 25-30 depend from amended independent claims 1, 16, 23, 24 and 30 adding further limitations thereto and so are believed to be allowable over Buxton et al for the same reasons noted above.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

***Rejection of Claims 14 and 15 Under 35 USC 103(a)***

Claims 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buxton et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed and is believed to be obviated in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Buxton et al simply does not show or suggest the present invention for the reasons given above and in Applicants' prior responses, most notably that Buxton's translator does not incorporate an instruction set which is demonstrated, in advance, to be compatible with a specific application program, as recited in the claims. The instruction set of the present invention, combined with the two input differing input device structure, are not shown or suggested by Buxton et al.

The addition of a general "translator" to convert a pointer change signal into a "command" in a "universal language" does nothing to remedy the situation and simply does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention, which, for claim 14, includes four input devices and, for claim 15, identifies the fourth input device as a keyboard. Finally, even if a combination of general knowledge and Buxton et al were to be made, as urged by the Examiner, it still would not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is asked to consider entering this response and amendment and pass the application to allowance.


Further and favorable consideration is requested.

Response and Amendment  
Application No. 10/073,929  
Filing Date: Feb. 14th, 2002  
Page 13 of 13

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims or the additional of independent claims in excess of three) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0548 and the undersigned is requested to be notified of any such charges.

Should the Examiner have any questions, he is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
J. Andrew McKinney, Jr.  
Registration No. 34,672

Date:

2/6/04

MAILING ADDRESS:  
LINIAK, BERENATO & WHITE, LLC  
6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240  
Bethesda, MD 20817

Contact information:  
Telephones: (410) 528-1167  
Facsimile: (410) 576-8962